



U.S. EPA PUBLIC MEETING
NL/TARACORP SUPERFUND SITE
GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS

- - -

FEBRUARY 8, 1990
AT GRANITE CITY TOWNSHIP HALL
2060 DELMAR AVENUE
GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS

- - -

CONDUCTED BY MARYANN LAFAIRE,
COMMUNITY RELATIONS COORDINATOR;
BRAD BRADLEY,
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER;
STEVEN SIEGEL,
OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL.

JO ELAINE FOSTER & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 1368 • GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS 62040 • 618/877-7016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

U.S. EPA PUBLIC MEETING
NL/ TARACORP SUPERFUND SITE
GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS

- - -

FEBRUARY 8, 1990
AT GRANITE CITY TOWNSHIP HALL
2060 DELMAR AVENUE
GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS

- - -

CONDUCTED BY MARYANN LAFAIRE,
COMMUNITY RELATIONS COORDINATOR;
BRAD BRADLEY,
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER;
STEVEN SIEGEL,
OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL.

I N D E X

	<u>PAGE</u>
Opening Remarks	4
Site Alternatives	9
Liability Issues	28
Questions & Answers	29

1 **OPENING REMARKS:**

2 **MS. LAFaire:** Good evening. I'd like to welcome
3 you to the public hearing. My name is MaryAnn LaFaire. I'm the
4 Community Relations Coordinator for the U.S. EPA, Region 5, in
5 Chicago.

6 Can you all hear me in the back of the room?

7 I'd like to welcome you to this public hearing to accept
8 comment on the EPA proposed plan to clean up at the NL/ Taracorp
9 Superfund Site.

10 I hope you all picked up an agenda on the table near the
11 front of the room. There was also a sign up sheet for the
12 mailing list, and a sign up sheet for public comments, two
13 separate sheets. If you're not on our mailing list, you're not
14 receiving information through the mail from us, please I'd like
15 to ask you to sign in on that sheet so we can include you for
16 further information.

17 I'd like you to give comments tonight, when we come to the
18 public portion of this hearing. Then I'd like you to sign in
19 on the comment sheet, so I can call you individually when we
20 come to that part of the hearing. If you follow on the agenda,
21 you'll see that first item on the agenda is Introductions, and
22 I'm giving Introductions, and the Purpose of the Meeting, and
23 then we'll go to the Site Alternatives.

24 And Brad Bradley, the Project Manager, who is with us
25 tonight, he is to my right, will be explaining those

1 alternatives. Then we'll get to liability, Steven Siegel, who's
2 to my left, U.S. EPA's Office Regional Counsel Attorney assigned
3 to this case, and we'll get to the portions of the hearing where
4 we'll answer questions.

5 There's many people who attended. We'd like to dedicate
6 roughly about an hour of tonight's hearing to question and
7 answers. However, after we get through the entire hearing
8 portion of this, we'll gladly stay around to answer any
9 questions, remaining questions that you may have. We'll be here
10 as long as you like to talk to us.

11 After the question and answer period, we'll take about a
12 five minute break. And those of you who do not wish to stay to
13 give oral public comments tonight, can either leave or you can
14 stay and listen to the public comments and talk to us later,
15 however you wish. At the break time, you may also sign up, and
16 you can decide at that point you'd like to give a public
17 comment.

18 The comment period, this is roughly the middle of the
19 comment period. It will be going on until February 24th. If
20 you do have a comment formulated tonight, that you'd like to
21 tell us orally, we do have a court reporter here, the woman to
22 my far right up here is a court reporter. She's taking down
23 everything that's being said tonight. So we'll have a
24 transcript of the comments that can be given tonight.

25 If you don't want to give us an oral comment tonight, and

1 you just came to gather some information together about the
2 site, then that's fine. You still have a few weeks left to
3 formulate comments and send it to us in the mail. You can have
4 until the 24th, as long as it is postmarked by then.

5 One more thing, and I'll repeat this as we get to it. When
6 you come to the portion where we do accept public comments,
7 there's a microphone close to the front a little bit to my
8 right. I'll call your name. If you could, step up to the mike
9 at that point and clearly state your name and address for the
10 court reporter that would be helpful.

11 - - -

12 Superfund is what we call the program set up to implement
13 the environmental law passed by Congress in 1980. Here are a
14 couple overhead slides for you.

15 I don't know if those of you in the back can read.
16 There are a few seats in front, if you would like to move up.

17 Superfund is what we call the program, as I said, to set
18 up, implement the environmental law passed by Congress in 1980.
19 It is the Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability
20 Act, sometimes referred to as CERCLA. The law was passed and
21 it enables the Superfund program to respond to sites that pose
22 threats for public health for the environment.

23 The threats we're able to address are actual or immediate
24 threats. As in the case of a spill, or a potential threat
25 where we may have contaminants that could some day become an

1 immediate threat, or sites where the potential for that to
2 happen exists. Typically, we begin the Superfund process with
3 site discovery.

4 I'm going to put another slide up for you. There is a
5 pamphlet out also on the table that is a copy of this slide.
6 It is actually a better copy. If you can follow along on the
7 Superfund processes, that's what I'm explaining.

8 Typically, we begin the Superfund process with site discovery.
9 This begins with identifying or findings the site. We then
10 conduct a site assessment, which is an early look at the site
11 to see if any contamination exists and if the site warrants
12 further study.

13 If it does, it is placed on the national priorities list,
14 making it eligible for an investigation under Superfund. We
15 then conduct what is called an RI, and that's short. Those are
16 the initials for Remedial Investigation. And FS which is called
17 Feasibility Study, these are to determine the nature and extent
18 of possible contamination, and to look at the ways in which we
19 deal with what we find.

20 At the end of the investigation and the study, we report
21 our findings, look over the alternatives suggested and choose
22 a preferred alternative. We then place our preferred
23 alternative, along with the other alternative, all for public
24 comment which is where we are right now, and why we are here
25 tonight.

1 This public comment period started on January 10th, as I
2 said, it will end on February 24th. We will address and
3 consider all the comments given to us, either tonight when if
4 you give us comments, or orally, in writing, and we will go on
5 to use the information in making a decision at this site.

6 After the decision is made, we will go into what is called
7 the RDRA. That's slang for Remedial Designer and Remedial
8 Action, part of the project which is the part that in effect
9 designs and conducts the remedy that we've selected for cleanup
10 at the site.

11 Before I conclude, I would like to mention three things.
12 We do continue community relations task at this site. We do
13 monitor or check for any immediate releases, and we do either
14 identify or continue to look for any potentially responsible
15 parties. And let me explain that.

16 That potentiates responsible parties that under the law
17 would be passed, or current owners, operators, transporters,
18 generators. If we do identify potentially responsible parties,
19 as this case in the Taracorp site, we ask them to volunteer,
20 take the cost of the investigation, and later on the remedy of
21 the cleanup.

22 NL Industries did undertake this investigation under the
23 supervision of the U.S. EPA and the Illinois EPA. The results
24 of their findings were present in a study to U.S. EPA and
25 Illinois EPA, and they are present in summary form to you

1 in the fact sheet, that you either received at your house or the
2 one that is on the table, this gray, Proposed Cleanup Action
3 sheet. If you don't have it, you can pick it up at the table
4 tonight.'

5 U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA did not agree with the part of
6 the study's recommendation in interpreting how much risk is
7 present at the site. U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA have chosen a
8 preferred alternative from the study, which the actions I
9 believe to be fully protective of the health in the environment,
10 based in part on recommendation from a national health agency.
11 And with that, I will let Brad Bradley, the Project Manager,
12 explain more.

13 MR. BRADLEY: As MaryAnn mentioned, my name is
14 Brad Bradley. I'm the Project Manager in the NL/ Taracorp Site.
15 I've been dealing with the site for about four years now. What
16 I'm going to discuss - - and I'm going to use a lot of overheads
17 here, so I'll just stand over here, is the remedial
18 investigation that was conducted, and the feasibility study that
19 was conducted at the site, and the proposed plan which is what
20 we've released for the public comment here; and then finally
21 what steps will be taken next in the Superfund process.

22 Starting with the remedial investigation, NL Industries
23 conducts the remedial investigation under United States EPA and
24 Illinois EPA over site. And what was done was soil and waste
25 and ground water and air samples were taken on site and in

1 surrounding areas.

2 And basic findings, that came from the study plan, was that
3 as far as surface water goes, there are no surface water bodies
4 anywhere near the site such as creeks or ponds. The only
5 surface water we ever observed on site was a small pooling of
6 water, that would occur during a heavy rain, which would just
7 collect in the base of the pile. That result was water was not
8 perceived to be a problem at this site.

9 With respect to the air, Illinois EPA monitoring locations
10 were utilized to provide data upon air quality. And what we
11 learn from that was that the lead air values around the site,
12 during the study, were well within the national standards for
13 air. And, basically, those wells all have been within the
14 national standards for lead since the shut down during 1983.

15 With respect to ground water, there were already some wells
16 existing on site from previous investigations, and two new wells
17 were drilled. And what we found from that was a well right next
18 to the site showed contamination, above what was coming into the
19 site, which we call background contamination; and several metals
20 were higher than background cadmium, magnesium and zinc.

21 And other than that well, the wells that were actually down
22 grading, or down stream in the ground water from the site, did
23 not show any increased readings over that which was coming into
24 the site.

25 And finally with respect to the soil and waste samples,

1 there were samples taken from the Taracorp pile, which is the
2 largest three and a half acre waste pile that's most visible on
3 this site, containing slag, crushed battery casings and all kind
4 of other debris.

5 Also samples were taken from St. Louis Lead Recycler's
6 pile, which is a smaller pile to the south, which is black in
7 color, and contains crushed hard rubber from the St. Louis Slag
8 Recycler's processes that were performed in the early eighties.

9 And we also sampled surrounding residential soils, one
10 thousand foot grid system, using the site as a central point.
11 We basically mapped out an area within about a one mile radius
12 from the site, and took samples at one thousand foot intervals
13 within that area.

14 And finally, we took samples in some alleys in Venice
15 Township and a ditch in Eagle Park Acres because the indication
16 from some residents, and from some old news clippings, was that
17 some of the hard rubber from the Taracorp pile was actually
18 taken and used as fill in those areas.

19 What we found from the sampling effort was that - - excuse
20 me one second. I'll put up the first couple of slides there,
21 just to indicate the areas that we sampled. That is the extent
22 of the area that we sampled in Eagle Park Acres, its housing
23 development, a couple miles south of the site, and basically
24 some hard rubber was used there as fill in the past; and in
25 excavating a ditch through the center, which is sort of mapped

1 out there with the dashed lines.

2 Some hard rubber was on earth, and that was sampled.

3 What was indicated from a sampling was that the lead levels were
4 elevated in the background, and were also at a level where some
5 remedial actions or some cleanup should have been taken.

6 There are the areas that were sampled in Venice Township,
7 indicated by the darkened areas and the dots. And, again, the
8 film material was taken from these alleys. Samples were
9 conducted, and physically these alleys range anywhere from when
10 they were paved, since the fill has been brought there, to where
11 the fill was still very evident. You can see it. It hadn't
12 been disturbed much. And the results vary widely from low
13 levels, near background of which no action would be necessary,
14 to levels up to one hundred and twenty-eight thousand parts per
15 mil, which is 12.8 percent lead.

16 And those areas were the elevated readings. It was the
17 only one with the level that high, no higher than 8,200 parts
18 per mil; but, nevertheless, there were areas as mapped out as
19 indicated in shaded strips up there that some cleanup action
20 needs to be taken.

21 Then with respect to the Taracorp pile, samples were taken
22 of the waste in the Taracorp pile, and the lead values in that
23 pile were one percent to twenty-eight percent; and there was
24 also some elevated levels of cadmium found in the pile.
25 And again, twenty-eight percent is 280,000 parts per mil. I'll

1 be using the term parts per mil throughout my speech here. And
2 a value of 280,000 is extremely high.

3 And St. Louis Lead Recycler's pile was also sampled, and
4 values therefore range from ten to thirty percent, which is ten
5 one hundred thousand to three hundred thousand parts per mil.
6 And the results of that sampling effort was that obviously some
7 action had to be taken to remediate, or clean up those piles,
8 or prevent any direct contact from those piles.

9 And, finally, as I said, there were one thousand foot grid
10 samples taken in the areas around the Taracorp site, the
11 residential areas within about a one mile sweep of the site.
12 And the values vary from fairly high, around three thousand
13 parts per mil, up near the site. As we progress further out,
14 generally the values went down to the point at which, in most
15 cases about a mile away from the site, they were more background
16 or somewhere around a hundred parts per mil, which is something
17 that wouldn't require remediation. So there were areas off site
18 that needed remediation, and there were some areas that we
19 sampled which did not.

20 So basically the impact from the remedial investigation was
21 we needed to take cleanup action on the Taracorp pile. St.
22 Louis Lead Recycler's pile, Venice alleys, the ditch in Eagle
23 Park Acres, which I showed earlier, and some of the residential
24 soils around the site; and that we should continue the ground
25 water monitoring and the air monitoring to make sure that

1 there is no thesis of any standards in the future.

2 And moving on, the step in the process, is the feasibility
3 study in which we evaluate and clean up alternative waste to
4 cleanup the site. Again, NL Industries wrote that the draft,
5 visibility study report, which United States EPA and Illinois
6 EPA reviewed and that report contains seven alternatives or
7 methods to clean up the site.

8 And the U.S. EPA commented on the draft report. All of the
9 comments were not incorporated into a final document. So U.S.
10 EPA and Illinois EPA wrote an addendum for the feasibility
11 study, which is basically attached to the feasibility study, and
12 presents the comments that U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA. And the
13 main point that came from the comments of the EPA was that an
14 eighth alternative was added to the list of seven, that NL
15 Industries had in their draft report.

16 What I'll do now is go through the different alternatives
17 that we consider to clean up the site.

18 The first alternative we call Alternative A. It is
19 basically called a No Action Alternative. And for the most
20 part, we leave it as is, leave the site the way it is, and do
21 some ground water monitor and air monitoring, and also put up
22 some fences where they don't exist already, and put some legal
23 deed or restrictions on the property upon which the site and
24 some of the surrounding areas are located.

25 What I mean by surrounding areas, would be immediately

1 adjacent to St. Louis Lead Recycler's property just to the
2 south, and the Tri-City Trucking area, which is to the south and
3 east of the site.

4 As you can see, the cost is low. It is \$475,000 estimated,
5 and time to actually perform the installations of monitoring
6 and fencing and all that would be six months to twelve
7 months.

8 - - -

9 The second alternative is Alternative B. There are some
10 drums on the Taracorp piles. There's about thirty to forty
11 drums of material that never made it into the furnace, which has
12 basically a very high lead content and could be recycled. So
13 those drums would be recycled in a secondary lead smelter away
14 from the NL site, and the St. Louis Lead Recycler's pile would
15 actually be excavated and brought to the Taracorp pile.

16 And the two piles, after being combined, would be capped,
17 which is a cover of soil, gravel and synthetic liner, total
18 thickness which is about three feet. And it is designed to make
19 sure that nobody can have direct contact with the waste, and to
20 deflect precipitation from going through the waste and picking
21 up any lead or other metal and getting down into the ground
22 water.

23 They would be provided with a cap, and also sod or asphalt
24 would be placed over designated areas in the residential areas
25 outside of the site, and also in the Venice alleys and Eagle

1 **Park Acres.**

2 I'll put up a film in a minute showing the exact areas
3 which Alternative B, and other alternatives, would apply to
4 within the neighborhoods around here. And also some wells would
5 be installed, and again ground water monitoring would be
6 implemented, and deed restrictions would be placed on the
7 property. And the total cost of this was about \$5.7 million,
8 estimated, and time to actually do the cleanup is one to two
9 years.

10 - - -

11 There was also a third alternative placed into the graph
12 feasibility study by NL Industries. However, for some
13 simplicity sake, U.S. EPA in its addendum because the third
14 alternative, which is called Alternative C, is very similar to
15 Alternative D, we'll only present all D and leave out C because
16 it is so similar to Alternative D.

17 - - -

18 Alternative D, again the drums on the Taracorp pile would
19 be recycled and taken off site to a secondary site to a
20 secondary lead smelter. And the St. Louis Lead Recycler's pile
21 would be brought in to the Taracorp pile, and also soils to
22 adapt the three inches would be excavated.

23 And in specified areas, in the residential areas, and also
24 the Venice alleys would be excavated, and Eagle Park Acres, the
25 areas that were shaded on the previous film would be excavated,

JO ELAINE FOSTER & ASSOCIATES 16

1 and all of this material would be brought into the Taracorp
2 pile.

3 And once it was brought into the pile, it would be provided
4 with a cap, as I described for Alternative B. And, again, there
5 would be ground water and water and air monitoring to check the
6 effectiveness of the remedy, and also there would be deed
7 restrictions of deed restrictions.

8 I'll put up a figure what areas Alternative D would apply
9 to.

10 This is a rather simplified map of Granite City. The site,
11 Taracorp site, is right over here where the dot is. And
12 Alternative D would basically apply from Cleveland Boulevard to
13 Madison between 6th and 18th, and then down south down to looks
14 like 14th Street, and on over to Washington Avenue from State.
15 So it would be in those areas that three inches of soil would
16 be excavated and brought into the pile before it is capped.

17 And one thing I forgot to mention about that one, the cost
18 of that one would be approximately \$6.8 million dollars, and it
19 would take one to two years to actually perform that clean up,
20 as well.

21 - - -

22 The fifth alternative was Alternative E. And Alternative
23 E is basically the same as what I just described for Alternative
24 D, with the exception that a portion of the property, either on
25 the Tri-City truck property, or the St. Louis Lead Recycler's

1 Property area, would be set aside and a clay liner would be
2 obtained on that property to provide a further barrier from
3 anything leaking out of the pile into the ground water.

4 And, unfortunately, one of the drawbacks of this
5 alternative is that the entire Taracorp pile would have to be
6 moved from its present location onto the liner along with the
7 rest of the soils, which would be dug up from the areas
8 indicated, and also the Venice alleys and Eagle Park Acres.

9 The cost would be increased significantly to approximately
10 31 million dollars, and it would take three to four years to
11 actually do this clean up from the point at which it actually
12 started.

13 - - -

14 The sixth alternative from the feasibility study report is
15 Alternative F. And Alternative F is basically the same as
16 Alternative E.

17 Everything would be dug up from the areas I mentioned
18 before. It would all be brought on to a liner, as Alternative
19 E. The one big exception of difference between Alternative F
20 and E is that prior to taking the Taracorp pile to the liner and
21 capping the resulting pile, there would be a recycling effort
22 made on the waste and the Taracorp pile.

23 Basically, the best estimates that we were provided with
24 were that that would only reduce the volume of the pile about
25 ten percent at a maximum. But any lead that can be recovered

1 from the plastic, broken battery casings, slag, would be
2 recovered.

3 And the cost of this remedy is approximately at 45 million
4 dollars, and this one would take five to six years to complete
5 once it is started.

6 - - -

7 Then a final alternative from the draft feasibility study
8 report is Alternative G. And Alternative G represents a full
9 removal scenario where all of the areas, the residential soils,
10 the Venice alleys, Eagle Park Acres, Taracorp Lead Recycler's
11 pile would be excavated and actually trucked off site out of
12 Granite City to a hazardous waste fill which would accept this.

13 And this remedy is the most expensive alternative. It is
14 67 million approximately, and it would take five to six years
15 to finish that one.

16 - - -

17 Then the eighth alternative is the alternative that United
18 States EPA and Illinois EPA added in to the draft feasibility
19 study, an addendum. And basically Alternative H is what I
20 described as Alternative D, areas, residential areas, Venice
21 alleys, Eagle Park Acres ditch, St. Louis Lead Recycler's pile,
22 would all be excavated, brought to the Taracorp pile and the
23 pile would be capped. There would be no liner, no recycling,
24 no trucked off sites.

25 It's the same as Alternative D, with the exception that

1 Alternative H includes a larger area where excavation would
2 occur in the residential soils, and also the depth of excavation
3 rather than being set at three inches, would be set based on a
4 clean up level of five hundred parts per mil of lead in the
5 soil.

6 And the anticipated impact of that cleanup standard of five
7 hundred parts per mil, or cleanup level, would be that the
8 average depth that would be excavated from a yard would be about
9 six inches. So it would basically double the depth. And I'll
10 put up an overhead that would indicate the areas that this would
11 imply to.

12 Now the cost of that one is 25 million, and it would take
13 one and a half to two and a half years to complete.

14 Those are the areas that would be involved in using a five
15 hundred corporate mil cleanup level. And, as you see, that is
16 significantly expanded from the Alternative D figure.

17 It would involve going from 21st Street down to 16th, and
18 roughly between Madison and Adams with the part that sticks out
19 over in - - I can't read the street name, but it's over next to
20 the Granite City Steel Plant.

21 Then it would go much further south down to 8th Street in
22 Madison, and over to the right further over around Edwardsville
23 Road and McCambridge, and would also add in some smaller sub
24 areas up to the north and east of the site, and also one small
25 portion of Madison down to the south and west side. And for

1 comparison purposes, I'll put another map on top of that.

2 They don't quite line up right. That's the basic
3 comparison. The area in the red would be the Alternative D
4 clean up in three inches. And the other in Alternative D would
5 be Alternative H, compared parts per mil standard of an average
6 of six inches in depth of cleanup.

7 - - -

8 Those are the alternatives, the six alternatives, which
9 U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA looked at as far as being alternatives
10 that could be applied to cleanup the site. That represents a
11 range from basically doing nothing to digging everything up and
12 taking it all away from Granite City to a hazardous waste
13 landfill.

14 It also represents quite a cost range from about a half a
15 million up to 67 million. And U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA wrote
16 a proposed plan, which is what is out for public comment right
17 now.

18 And in that proposed plan, Alternative H, with the expanded
19 cleanup area in the five hundred part mil cleanup level for lead
20 and soil, was selected by the agencies as the preferred
21 alternative. And that's what is up to the public comment right
22 now, that proposed plan.

23 - - -

24 And just a few thoughts on why Alternative H was selected,
25 as opposed to a more limited area of excavation such as showing

1 Alternative D. It is that if there's a standard, then we would
2 go with that. We would use that. However, there is not a
3 standard for cleanup of lead and soil. It just doesn't exist.

4 - - -

5 The next best thing that we use, if there is not a
6 standard, is called a risk assessment. However, there was some
7 values that are needed to perform a risk assessment, which are
8 with ground and pollutant under consideration at the time this
9 report was being written by NL Industries, and also up to the
10 present. So risk assessment was not possible to be done on this
11 site, at least with accepted values that were published.

12 And, finally, in the absence of all of that, we would defer
13 or go to a guidance document, or any other existing study that
14 we have. And there's a guidance document, interim guidance
15 document, that was issued which quotes range of five hundred
16 parts per mil to one thousand parts per mil for a cleanup,
17 suggested cleanup level for lead in soil, and we use that.

18 And the reason that we chose five hundred, out of that
19 range of five hundred to a thousand, was because basically for
20 one reason this is an industrial setting. There's a lot of
21 other industries here besides NL Industries or Taracorp, and so
22 people in this area are exposed to more than just one chemical,
23 more than just lead.

24 And so, the impact of all of those exposures would tend to
25 be greater than if this were just a site out in a rural area

1 with just lead involved. So we went toward the lower end of the
2 range. That was one of the reasons. And, additionally, as I
3 said, some critical numbers were withdrawn so that we couldn't
4 do a risk assessment.

5 There are also a lot of other standards, including the
6 maximum contaminant level for lead in drinking water, which are
7 under reconsideration at this point. Because recent findings
8 on the health impacts of lead indicate that it may be worse than
9 was anticipated in the past, and so we went with the lower end
10 of the range. Because basically what's been happening is
11 standards are under consideration. What they're considering
12 lower values, such as what they are considering for drinking
13 water, for standard for lead at this point.

14 MR. LANCE: What is the drinking lead standard
15 for lead at this point?

16 MR. BRADLEY: I'll answer that. He asked what
17 the drinking water standard was. It is fifty parts per mil,
18 which is .05 parts per mil of lead in drinking water. That's
19 a current standard. The proposed standard is five parts per
20 mil, which is .005 parts per mil.

21 Now the next step in this process, I just finished with the
22 proposed plan. We will put the proposed plan out for public
23 comment, as I mentioned. And we call it a proposed plan because
24 it is just that. It is proposed. It is not the final cleanup
25 decision for the site. And the public comments are very

1 important to us in formulating the final remedy for the site.
2 A day that's coming up soon is that February 24th is the
3 end of the public comment period, and then we will consider the
4 public comments and write a final decision document, which we
5 call a record of decision, which will indicate what alternative
6 we've selected for that site. Then that will be published and
7 final. And along a similar pathway is who's going to do the
8 cleanup. I'll put up a slide here.

9 So, like I said, dates, key points February 24th, the end
10 of public comment period, March 30th is the anticipated date
11 where the record of decision, which would be detailed the actual
12 cleanup that will be recommending or putting into place, should
13 be assigned around more the 30th. And then again, as far as who
14 undertakes the cleanup, the dates at the bottom, March 15 to
15 July 15, those are rough estimates. Those can easily change
16 based on conditions that can come up.

17 But to give an estimate of how this is going to fall into
18 place, about mid to late March, this year, U.S. EPA will issue
19 a letter to each of the potentially responsible parties, which
20 MaryAnn mentioned is the NL Industries/ Taracorp, generators and
21 transporters of materials brought to the site, will issue a
22 letter to all of them giving them a hundred twenty days, or
23 roughly four months, to enter into an agreement with U.S. EPA
24 and Illinois EPA to do the cleanup themselves. And certainly
25 that's what we'll encourage as to get those potentially

1 responsible parties to pay for the cleanup themselves, and we
2 will provide the over site for that cleanup.

3 And if the date starts mid to late March, then a four month
4 period would end late to mid July. If we don't get an agreement
5 for the potential responsible parties to do the cleanup, we have
6 two options. We can enforce against them to do the cleanup, or
7 we can do the cleanup ourselves and recover costs from the
8 potentially responsible parties at a later date after we finish
9 the cleanup.

10 And then again, we put it in perspective. If we get an
11 agreement with the potentially responsible parties to do, for
12 them to do the cleanup about late July, it will be a one year
13 period where we will design the remedy, actually put it down in
14 writing and drawings, and of drawings of specification, what has
15 to be done to do the remedy that's discussed in the record of
16 decision, and then actually cleanup or movement of the dirt,
17 drilling, monitoring wells, any type of action on the site would
18 be approximately the summer of '91.

19 And one final note, before I turn it over to Steve Siegel.
20 We have identified, to this date, two hundred seventy
21 potentially responsible parties for this site. Again, they
22 include generators, transporters, NL Industries and Taracorp,
23 and also some property owners that are adjacent such as St.
24 Louis Lead Recycler's, Tri-City Trucking. And so there are two
25 hundred seventy companies that we will be sending a letter to.

1 And we will, as I said, encourage them to take over the cleanup.

2 I know that one concern people had. We have had some
3 sessions in late January. Would this impact Taracorp? Would
4 they have to pay for the whole thing? The answer to that is no.
5 They wouldn't. There will be two hundred seventy other
6 potentially responsible parties that we will be sending the same
7 letter to. And with that alternative, I'll turn it over to
8 Steve Siegel.

9 MR. SIEGEL: Thanks, Brad.

10 It's wonderful to see the number of people that are here
11 tonight. We weren't sure how many people would be here, and
12 what we want to address at this point is we have a proposed
13 plan, which is a recommendation. And this is the time where the
14 community makes an impact on what is done between now and the
15 24th.

16 You're comments, the formal comments, that will be
17 presented at the end have to be considered by EPA. We have to
18 come up with a response of this summary, it is called, which
19 goes through each of the comments and responses to it as part
20 of our decision. That's a formal process. So everything has
21 to be considered. We very much appreciate, especially a site
22 like this where the community really is going to be involved,
23 that rather than react to something that's done, you are part
24 of the process.

25 What I am going to turn on in a second is a video

1 presentation, which is going to last about twenty or twenty-five
2 minutes, and that's another cleanup site in LaSalle, Illinois.
3 That's in the process in LaSalle. There are certain
4 differences. Every site is unique.

5 The differences, in part, PCB was the major contaminant.
6 Another difference was the number of homes that were going to
7 be involved, which was less than the number of homes that are
8 involved in Granite City. A third difference that should be
9 considered while you're watching this presentation, the degree
10 of work that was done in the community, and the presentation
11 that we're going to show you, there was a much greater degree
12 of work that was done. Approximately three feet of soil was
13 removed from residential areas and people's homes.

14 In Granite City, under the plan as it stands right now,
15 approximately six inches, possibly a little more will be
16 removed. And the major similarity, and the reason that we want
17 to show you this presentation, is because the residential
18 communities are involved in LaSalle, and here there is going to
19 be in fact other residential areas.

20 We want to show this, and get some people's feelings of how
21 the work process is done, how the law works, and hopefully
22 project some questions in the need to talk to your neighbors.
23 As a great number of people that showed up tonight, we're hoping
24 that you talk to your neighbors and get them involved and get
25 them to submit to some arguments in writing, also.

1 (Whereupon, the video was played.)

2 MR. SIEGEL: We hope that was useful to raise
3 some questions, and to have you all see an example site that's
4 actually worked on, that has involved the community.

5 Again, I will remind you there are certain differences from
6 the site. Three feet of the soil is removed versus the six
7 inches, or possibly a bit more than we anticipate.

8 At this site, in the video presentation, you saw the people
9 working inside the home. You saw them removing trees. And none
10 of that is anticipated in Granite City. So it is different in
11 that way.

12 But again in Granite City a much larger number of homes
13 are involved, and that's why we think your participation is
14 absolutely essential. And we encourage you to stay tonight for
15 the questions, and to make your comments and to get your
16 neighbors involved.

17 Another similarity we hope that this slide will share,
18 compared to the one in LaSalle, is the efforts that were put
19 into talking to the people, getting the property owner involved.

20 Brad already went through the people who are considered
21 potential responsible parties, who will be negotiated to help
22 clean up the process work. But it is still going to involve the
23 home owners, the property owners. And while the Superfund
24 entitles it, there are certain powers involved that allow court
25 orders to get access to property. That is what is done in

1 LaSalle, and it is not what we hope to do here.

2 What we want you to know is involve home owners, talk to
3 them and get their consent to go ahead on to the land and go
4 ahead through the cleanup process. In LaSalle there was one
5 hundred percent participation, and that's what we're hoping for
6 here to get this thing cleaned up as quickly and easily and
7 thoroughly as possible.

8 Now at this point, I think we can begin. I'll let MaryAnn
9 come up, and we'll get going with the question and answer
10 session.

11 MS. LAFIRE: We're going to have about an hour
12 for the question and answer period. I know you all received a
13 lot of information tonight. And you probably have a lot of
14 questions. In all fairness to everyone, I'm going to try and
15 call on all of you separately, one at a time. You raise your
16 hand for questions. And if I can ask you to limit your question
17 to one question per time, so we can try to get different people
18 who have different questions.

19 We can do this for roughly an hour. And after that hour,
20 we'll take a fifteen minute break and then after we receive
21 comments from everyone. We'll stick around for more questions
22 if you have questions. I'll open it up for questions at this
23 time.

24 SPECTATOR: In the past experience, how close do
25 you really come to your estimated cost and length of time that

1 is going to take to do this?

2 And also, what is the real cost involved, as opposed to
3 just a dollar figure in terms of lost time for the residence of
4 the area and so on? What do you expect the real cost to be on
5 this issue?

6 MS. LAFIRE: Can we repeat the question? The
7 question was how close do we come to the real cost, and what's
8 the length of time it takes to do it?

9 MR. BRADLEY: Okay. I'll answer that one.

10 I haven't dealt with a great number of sites. But the ones
11 I have dealt with, we generally come pretty close to the cost
12 estimates and time frames. Obviously, the time frames can
13 change. They can be faster or slower, based on how many people
14 are put out to work on the job. You can put on three crews to
15 work at different spots, and meet in the middle, and go a lot
16 faster than if you put one small crew out there. It is variable
17 as far as time. We come close. It is give or take fifty
18 percent of that.

19 If we say one and a half to two and a half, which is
20 already a range, it might go up to a four maximum. We've been
21 pretty close on this in the past. As far as time loss to the
22 residence, I can't really answer that. I don't know. That
23 wasn't figured in to the cost estimate. I'm not really sure how
24 you would estimate that.

25 SPECTATOR: I had asked earlier if there would

1 be somebody here from the Department of Public Health. And was
2 that affirmative? Is that person here that I can direct that
3 question for?

4 MR. BRADLEY: No. What happened was we invited
5 someone, not the Department of Public Health, but the agency for
6 Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. We invited someone.
7 They had another appointment.

8 SPECTATOR: There was apparently a study done on
9 Granite City, specifically. That was subsequent to anything
10 that was in the information over in the library, and I was just
11 wondering how I can get a copy of that study.

12 MR. LONG: Could I interrupt just a moment?
13 Because I am from the Department of Public Health. We weren't
14 invited, but we are here to listen to EPA. Although I don't
15 have any specific comments to make on the record, I would be
16 happy to talk to anybody afterwards and try and answer
17 questions. My name is Tom Long, L-o-n-g.

18 MS. LAFAIRE: I'm going to repeat that.
19 Tom, can you stand?

20 The gentleman in the brown jacket is Tom Long. He is from
21 the State Department of Health and he said he would gladly stay
22 and answer questions regarding health after the meeting, if
23 anyone has any questions.

24 SPECTATOR: Could I ask a question of him? Are
25 you aware of the study of which I speak of, and if so how would

1 I get a copy of it, or at least access to it?

2 MR. LONG: I am aware of the study, yes. And as
3 far as I know, if it was formally written up, you can have a
4 copy. If not, the data could be summarized for you provided.
5 That was about five or four years ago, I think.

6 SPECTATOR: Was that the federal or a state?

7 MR. LONG: State.

8 SPECTATOR: I need to get in touch with the State
9 Department of Public Health?

10 MR. LONG: See me afterwards and I'll get your
11 address.

12 MR. BRADLEY: Just to add, I believe that study
13 attached into the Remedial Investigation in the library.

14 It's an attachment. There is a study that was done on the
15 remedial investigation done by NL Industries, the feed work was
16 done in '87. The report came in '88, and they put as a pendency
17 a lot, or other studies that were done. They attached that
18 report that was in there.

19 SPECTATOR: I had understood there was another
20 study done that was not in that information.

21 MR. BRADLEY: I guess I'm not sure what study
22 you're talking about.

23 SPECTATOR: You're not aware of any other study?

24 MR. BRADLEY: There were some studies done as
25 part of establishing whether or not Granite City was an

1 attainment area for the national quality standard for lead.
2 Those were done back in the early eighties by Illinois EPA, and
3 those predated remedial investigations. And then there's - -
4 I think what you're talking about is 1982 study by Illinois
5 Department of Public Health where they took blood samples and
6 analyzed them for lead, and that one is attached to the remedial
7 investigation.

8 SPECTATOR: That does not sound like the study
9 that I was told existed.

10 MS. LAFAIRE: Can we get you that information
11 just in case anyone else wants to ask a question.

12 SPECTATOR: What are we supposed to do with our
13 children, who play out in this stuff, from now until 1991 when
14 they come out and decide to clean this up?

15 MS. LAFAIRE: The question is what to do with the
16 children, who are playing in the soil, from now until 1991, and
17 when and if the clean up date is expected or - -

18 MR. BRADLEY: With respect to that, one thing
19 that is good to do is to have the children tested for lead in
20 their blood, and then consult the physician, your physician, and
21 have them tell you what means.

22 Unfortunately, different individuals do react differently
23 to lead, just as they do to a lot of other things like cigarette
24 smoke. So it would be best to consult the physician, and that
25 would give you some real numbers that you could give to the

1 physician to have a blood lead test done.

2 Also, we had some recommendations there. They are in a
3 sheet that's available up on this table. I believe
4 recommendations, such as to allowing the children to play out
5 in the dirt, in the yards, and also if you do have a garden,
6 it's best to wash the vegetables before you eat them. Those are
7 some of the recommendations. Those are the two biggest ones.

8 MS. LAFIRE: That was on one of them sheets of
9 paper. If you don't have it, you can see me and I'll take your
10 name and address and I'll send it to you.

11 SPECTATOR: I have two parts. The one is mostly
12 dealing with stock piling all of the material in one area.

13 Is this eliminating the problem, or just putting it at a
14 central location so we can try to contain it? Or is it going
15 to remove it entirely as the problem? Answer that one, and
16 we'll go to another.

17 MS. LAFIRE: The question is the alternatives
18 we're listing includes stock piling the material in a pile, and
19 the question is is this going to eliminate the problem or just -
20 -

21 SPECTATOR: Post pone it a little bit down the
22 line?

23 MR. BRADLEY: In answer to that, the pile, the
24 Taracorp pile, and the terms that are going to be brought into
25 it, under the alternative we're representing, don't lend

1 themselves to being burdened, or some of the conventional
2 methods that you can use to actually eliminate the problem.

3 The incineration doesn't work with metal. That is
4 something we cannot do. The only alternative that really could
5 be used where the pile is removed and the problem is taken away
6 would be the Alternative G, the most expensive alternative, in
7 which it would all be removed, that would end up somewhere else.
8 It wouldn't be here.

9 As far as the problem, no, it doesn't destroy the
10 contamination. What we're recommending, yes, it is still in
11 place; however, the cap that would be placed on the pile would
12 prevent direct contact with contaminating materials, and yards
13 would be dug up and brought in as well.

14 So the direct contact, ingestion, eating of soil and also
15 the breathing of dust with lead in it, would be reduced to a
16 risk level that we would feel as acceptable by this, and the cap
17 wouldn't just be placed and then left. It would be maintained.

18 SPECTATOR: If there were erosions that occurred,
19 it would have to be passed. For some reason it cracked, would
20 that be replaced? What I understand it would control the dust
21 or the physical contact. How about the running of the water
22 through the sod?

23 MR. BRADLEY: The run off of water to the side,
24 if in a rainfall event or snow melt, it would actually be
25 flowing off the side and it wouldn't be hitting clean soil and

1 flowing off. It wouldn't be in contact with the waste
2 materials. There might be a small portion which would get down
3 through the liner and get into the waste material.

4 And because that situation may exist where some of that
5 will get down through it and possibly get it into the ground
6 level, we will continue the ground water monitoring program and
7 any action that's necessary. If we see lead down grading from
8 the pile in the further, any action will be taken.

9 MS. LAFIRE: Second part?

10 SPECTATOR: Since this has been in the
11 newspapers, what have you, it's been brought to our attention,
12 the Board of Realtors, that there might be additional sites from
13 cases brought out in 1962 for driveways and such and other
14 locations. And a couple of the owners of the properties have
15 been calling all the agencies to find out how to characterize
16 what party to get into this because they feel that they have got
17 contamination on their property. If so, from your publicity of
18 this and there are additional sites, who do they contact?

19 MS. LAFIRE: Let me try and repeat this back to
20 you. The question is people have been calling the Board of
21 Realtors wondering if they would be part of an additional - -

22 SPECTATOR: In 1962 they had some fill brought
23 in to contractors from the Taracorp pile, whatever pile, lead,
24 whatever before, and there are roadways was made out of it. And
25 they're concerned how to get to this program now and who to

1 contact.

2 MS. LAFIRE: They believe that they may have
3 some contaminated material, and they would like to be tested.
4 And so they're wondering who to contact. That's the question.

5 MR. BRADLEY: Well, they can just contact me.
6 My name is Brad Bradley, the number is (312) 886-4742.

7 MS. LAFIRE: One other point with that Brad's
8 name is listed in the fact sheet that we handed out tonight.
9 I have some extras. I'm going to leave the extras on the table.
10 You're welcome to take as many as you like to pass out to
11 people.

12 MR. BRADLEY: One other thing. We'd like to hear
13 those kind of concerns. Like, as I said, there was a hard
14 rubber taken to Eagle Park Acres. There's four other government
15 agencies. So we've got an answer to go back, I would encourage
16 that because we would like to know if there are additional
17 locations.

18 SPECTATOR: Where is the Illinois Environmental
19 Protection Agency? Are these people present tonight?

20 MS. LAFIRE: Where is the Illinois Environmental
21 Protection Agency? Yes, they are here. They are in the
22 audience tonight.

23 SPECTATOR: I would like to know which alleys in
24 the City of Venice were determined with lead. It's a fact that
25 we do know that all of the alleys in the city were filled,

1 pot holes were filled with this material. So we'd like to know
2 how to go about getting those.

3 MS. LAFIRE: The questions is which alleys in
4 the City of Venice were filled.

5 SPECTATOR: We know that all of them were filled,
6 and I do understand they pot check. We did have all of our
7 alleys in the city filled with that material at one time or
8 another.

9 MS. LAFIRE: It is more of a comment. But the
10 comment or question is that the alleys in Venice were filled.
11 And we appreciate that information to be given to us as a
12 comment.

13 MR. BRADLEY: I can mention which alleys. I put
14 up an over head it may be hard to read. There's an area of
15 Slough Road, and there's an alley between Lincoln and Broadway.
16 There's a church right there. That is part of what we sampled.
17 There is one between Abbott and Hampton and one between Weber
18 and Grandville, and those are the areas.

19 I drove around the area, and you can see that there are
20 little pieces strewn here and there throughout some of the
21 areas. But the real concentration are in those four locations
22 I just read to you. If there are any other ones where we have
23 that kind of material, we'd be interested in doing that.

24 SPECTATOR: I think you missed my point. What
25 I'm saying is all the alley's pot holes were filled with this

1 material at one point or the other, all of them.

2 MR. BRADLEY: This would be high rubber from
3 Taracorp pile?

4 SPECTATOR: This battery type material that we're
5 dealing with now.

6 MR. BRADLEY: Okay. We'll take that into
7 consideration.

8 Like I said, I did drive around. It is kind of hard to
9 tell where it was and wasn't.

10 SPECTATOR: What he is telling you, the problem
11 is bigger than you realize.

12 SPECTATOR: Is there a possibility that the homes
13 will be destroyed with the cleanup, actually the excavation?

14 MS. LAFAIRE: The question is is there a
15 possibility that the homes would actually be destroyed versus
16 the cleanup alternatives that we're proposing?

17 MR. BRADLEY: No. Simple answer, no. What we're
18 proposing to do doesn't involved destructions of homes. It
19 involves roughly six inches excavation of soil, gravel and very
20 small vegetation like grass or small shrubs; not trees, cement
21 or asphalt driveways and certainly not homes.

22 SPECTATOR: The alternatives that are proposed
23 here by the NL Industries, except for the one where they haul
24 everything away, lists first recycling, get the recyclable lead
25 out. Who does that? Who gets the money for it? What's the

1 cost of the step in the process?

2 MS. LAFAIRE: The question is all of the
3 alternatives outside of the last, lists recycling the lead.
4 There is a three part question. Who does it? What's the cost
5 of it, and what are the steps to doing it?

6 SPECTATOR: I want to know who recaps the
7 profit.

8 MS. LAFAIRE: Who gets the money of the recycled
9 material's profit?

10 MR. BRADLEY: If anybody has a question in the
11 middle, there's a live mike right here. It might serve you well
12 to step to it.

13 The alternatives which list recycling, that's recycling,
14 like I said, about thirty to forty drums of material that never
15 went into the furnace right before it got shut down. It is a
16 very small portion. We don't have anyone designated to recycle
17 it at this point. I doubt that it would recap much profit, if
18 any. I mean that's something that we would determine in the
19 design portion, which will be coming up.

20 SPECTATOR: So it's not the big cost, just the
21 recycling?

22 MR. BRADLEY: No. That is not a big cost. It
23 is actually very small.

24 SPECTATOR: What is the biggest cost of hauling
25 everything away? What is the largest of that cost?

1 MR. BRADLEY: You mean the alternative that was
2 the most expensive?

3 SPECTATOR: Getting everything out of here.

4 MR. BRADLEY: Actually, there's a lot of things
5 involved with that. I mean moving the Taracorp pile is a very
6 large job. Also digging up that large area of residential soils
7 would have a large cost associated with it.

8 SPECTATOR: That's already built into your
9 recommended step, your recommended alternative?

10 MR. BRADLEY: What's in addition that you have
11 to transport to a hazardous waste landfill that is EPA approved,
12 and would accept it, and there aren't any in the immediate
13 vicinity.

14 So the transportation cost would be very high, and also you
15 have to pay to have it accepted there, and this would be a very
16 large quantity of material. And they would charge you by the
17 truck load, and you would be talking thousands of truck loads.
18 That's where the differential comes in.

19 SPECTATOR: I would like to know if this
20 operation is a one phase operation?

21 MS. LAFAIRE: Is this one operation, one phase
22 operation?

23 SPECTATOR: Yes.

24 MS. LAFAIRE: Is your question will it be done
25 all in one step?

1 SPECTATOR: To clean up all the contaminated area
2 all at once?

3 MR. BRADLEY: As we proposed it, as one step
4 operation, that lasts one and a half to two and a half years.

5 SPECTATOR: We would like to be on record that
6 Eagle Park Acres has more than one site.

7 MS. LAFAIRE: The comment is that this woman
8 would like to reiterate that Eagle Park Acres has more than one
9 site.

10 SPECTATOR: Yes. I guess I would like to
11 question why the origin of EPA's policy, having disputed that
12 as a party that conducts the feasibility study, and it also
13 seems to be a problem since they are going to be the ones paying
14 a cost. Isn't that to be a more - -

15 MS. LAFAIRE: The question is where does the
16 policy originate, to have the person who did the contamination
17 undertake the investigation? And also why should the person or
18 people, possession attending responsible parties, undertake the
19 clean up? Isn't it a conflict of interest?

20 MR. SIEGEL: Well, that's a good question. The
21 plan was proposed by EPA, so the people who may be responsible
22 for paying for it were not the ones to propose the plan. So the
23 conflict of interest is they're taken away.

24 Before we begin the actual negotiations, we go through this
25 process tonight, through public comment, to come up with the

1 record of decision. And it is the record of decision that is
2 the plan that we ultimately determine to use, which we negotiate
3 with those parties to implement so that we have something
4 concrete that we're looking for. That way we try to take away
5 any conflict of interest there. The sources of that you asked,
6 that has to do with the Superfund law itself.

7 The purpose of the law is first to get the sites cleaned
8 up, but also to preserve the fund and have those parties who
9 are responsible for the contamination paying for the cost of
10 it. That way makes many areas possible through the country can
11 be included in the program.

12 SPECTATOR: Earlier you used the term background
13 level. What is that? What's the number value given the
14 background level?

15 MR. BRADLEY: Number values, I wouldn't be able
16 to quote on those off the top of my head. That's in the
17 remedial investigation. And we checked for a series of
18 different metals, about ten to twelve different metals, and also
19 some - - what we call indicative perimeters totally dissolved
20 solids, sulfates and things like that. I don't know the numbers
21 off the top of my head.

22 SPECTATOR: That pollution was caused by air
23 pollution? Or was that - - that's the area off of Niedringhaus
24 and those residential areas. Was that caused by the air
25 pollution of the smelter, or was that from hauling?

1 MR. BRADLEY: The most likely source of that is
2 the air, from the smelter stack. The areas such as Venice and
3 Eagle Park, that's from hauling. Those are well aware from the
4 site, and you have high levels there that are many times higher
5 than right next to the site. That's from having waste out
6 there, the hard rubber we used to fill. But immediately around
7 the site, the primary cause of all of that contamination right
8 around that Taracorp site, would be deposition from the smelter
9 stack in the past.

10 SPECTATOR: What's being done about this Taracorp
11 pile now, at the present time? Is it just sitting there and
12 wind blowing more contaminants through the area?
13 And how do you determine that six inches is enough soil to be
14 removed?

15 MS. LAFIRE: The question is what's being done
16 about the Taracorp pile right now? Is the wind blowing
17 contaminants around? And how did we determine that six inches
18 is far enough today?

19 MR. BRADLEY: The first question. There's
20 something being done to prevent or minimize the dust from
21 blowing from the Taracorp pile right now. It is under
22 requirement of different law. But what is being done is a
23 material is being sprayed onto the entire surface of the pile,
24 periodically, to bind up the dust so it won't blow.

25 And that's been determined, that given a certain material

1 to be sprayed on, and a certain period of time, that you have
2 to apply that, and that will keep the dust down. That's done
3 under the resource conservation and recovery act which is very
4 close to the law that I deal with, except that it deals with
5 companies who are still operating, still generating waste; and
6 they have required that of Taracorp, and it is being done.

7 And as far as six inches, that's not exactly what we're
8 going to do. That's an average depth. That's what we
9 anticipate the average depth would be. It may be deeper in some
10 cases. It may be only two or three inches in some cases. What
11 we're using to determine how deep to go is a five hundred mil
12 lead cleanup level.

13 That's what we're using and what we would have to do, part
14 of the reason why it would take about a year to design this
15 thing before we actually start lifting out any soils. We would
16 have to go in and sample each yard in enough places to determine
17 how deep to dig that particular yard. And we would use five
18 hundred part of a mil to know when to stop. Six inches is just
19 an estimate of the average depth.

20 SPECTATOR: This recycling place that you're
21 talking about, along with Taracorp, why are they still building
22 a pile to be cleaned up? We have watched it grow for the last
23 three months, triple its size.

24 MR. BRADLEY: Are you talking about the black
25 hard rubber pile?

1 SPECTATOR: Yes. We watched it triple its size
2 in the last few months.

3 MR. BRADLEY: In the last few months?

4 SPECTATOR: Since October.

5 MR. BRADLEY: That's something I wasn't aware of.

6 SPECTATOR: It has. Sis and I have watched it
7 grow.

8 MR. BRADLEY: That's something we would be
9 interested in. You're talking about the one south of us on the
10 recycler's off of State Street?

11 SPECTATOR: Yes.

12 MR. BRADLEY: I'll be down there tomorrow and
13 I'll take a look.

14 SPECTATOR: It is three times as it was in
15 October, at least.

16 MR. BRADLEY: I was down there and it looked
17 about the same to me. We'll check that.

18 SPECTATOR: If the contamination, the general
19 contamination, around the areas is due to smelter operations,
20 is that idea confirmed by the wind arose data for prevailing
21 winds in this area?

22 MR. BRADLEY: Yes, it is. What he means by wind
23 arose data is what plot is most prevalent, or most often noticed
24 wind direction that the wind comes from. So what you get is
25 over a year if the wind is from the southwest more than it is

1 from the northwest, the plot would be larger in that direction.

2 And what happens is air, people who take a look at the air
3 effects of given stacks, such as the Taracorp stack, use that
4 data to figure out where the most likely areas that that
5 contamination would be located, and the winds were looked at as
6 part of the Illinois EPA study back in the early eighties; and
7 yes, it does follow those patterns pretty well.

8 SPECTATOR: Are we going to have to leave our
9 homes? And where is the dirt you're going to take away, what
10 dirt are you going to bring back?

11 MR. BRADLEY: You don't have to leave your home.
12 There will be some construction noise, which will be annoying,
13 but not like that film where they dug, they took out trees and
14 they actually came in and mopped up the houses.

15 It was a little different situation with the PCB going
16 around the neighborhood. They got in and stuck to the walls and
17 shelves and things like that. No. You don't have to leave your
18 home.

19 Could you repeat the second part?

20 SPECTATOR: What dirt is going to be brought
21 back?

22 MR. BRADLEY: We would find a clean source of
23 fill. We're going to have to - - might have to go a little
24 distance, but find a clean source of fill and bring it back just
25 as in that video we would restore it the way it was. If there

1 was a bush in a certain spot, another bush would be replaced.
2 If we were to remove what they did, and it's a good idea they
3 took pictures of the way it was before they started each yard
4 and took pictures, and that it's restore the way it was when it
5 came in.

6 SPECTATOR: You put the grass and everything
7 back?

8 MR. BRADLEY: Yes. Grass put back if you have
9 a graveled driveway, if you had small plants, those would be
10 replanted.

11 SPECTATOR: I've got a health question to
12 address.

13 I've been born and raised on 14th and Grand, that is Number
14 3 zone that you talk about. And as far as I know, about eleven
15 out of twenty-five people in the long term residence on that
16 block have succumbed from cancer or some type of respiratory
17 problem.

18 Now my question is will it be dedicated toward the health
19 effects of people, other than we know that lead effects people
20 as far as developmental behavior. What does it do as
21 carcinogens are concerned, how cancer is produced, is it really
22 - -

23 MR. LONG: You want me or anybody?

24 Lead is considered a carcinogen by the U.S. EPA. But,
25 frankly, I don't believe it is very carcinogenous. The

1 neurologic effects associated are more frightening. Frankly,
2 that is carcinogen potential, if it exists, is limited to a
3 occupational standard as for some of the others. But again for
4 environmental setting, I would think the effects of the kidney
5 would be more important than the carcinogen potential. I don't
6 think cancer is a real issue here regarding these metals.

7 SPECTATOR: The figures are abnormally high for
8 a block, the location to the Taracorp site.

9 MR. LONG: We can check that. We have records
10 that allow us to check that. I can't tell you. If you want to
11 see me afterwards.

12 SPECTATOR: I would urge you to check that.

13 MR. LONG: I would point out that any other
14 cancer, and the multitude of other exposure you are going to get
15 in Granite City, it could be, you know, passing steel mill. On
16 my way in here, the coking procedure was going on full blast.
17 Believe me, that is carcinogenic.

18 SPECTATOR: It becomes accumulative effect, no
19 doubt.

20 MR. LONG: Please see me afterwards, and I can
21 tell you what we can do.

22 MR. BRADLEY: Also we can give you the phone
23 number of the representative of the agency for Toxic Substance
24 and Disease Registry, and you can also get their perspective on
25 it. They're the ones that U.S. EPA consults with regarding

1 health effects after different chemicals. So they have
2 something to do with that.

3 SPECTATOR: Basically, the same as Mr. Mance,
4 except mine is my entire family who was raised and lived in that
5 1600 block of Edison, and I have written up the medical history
6 on our family, and I'd like you to have it.

7 And one other thing. How often do you test water?

8 MS. LAFAIRE: The first part was more or less a
9 comment that was backing up, and I assume Mr. Mance.

10 SPECTATOR: The high percentage of cancer.

11 MS. LAFAIRE: The comment is, and this woman's
12 family, we have this will be accepted as a comment.

13 The question is how often do we test water or is water
14 tested.

15 MR. BRADLEY: As far as testing the water, it was
16 tested twice during 1987, actually three times during 1987. I
17 believe early 1988.

18 SPECTATOR: I have a well on my property that NL
19 and EPA asked to put on it. It is on my property. As far as
20 I know, it was tested only in 1987.

21 MR. BRADLEY: Which well would that be?

22 SPECTATOR: 1640 Edison Avenue.

23 MS. LAFAIRE: 1640 Edison Avenue.

24 MR. BRADLEY: Was that installed recently?

25 SPECTATOR: That was installed in July of '87.

1 MR. BRADLEY: I believe that one was tested twice
2 then. That one is actually, because of its location, would tend
3 to be - - if I understand right, I think that's the one I'm
4 thinking about. It is actually upgrading from the pile.

5 The other one is down there by St. Louis Lead Recyclers, and
6 across State Street in that vacant lot. Some of them along the
7 Taracorp lots and along the railway, those are the down grading.

8 SPECTATOR: What would be the object of putting
9 that well on that property and testing it only two times?

10 MR. BRADLEY: That's what we do for the remedial
11 investigation for the actual cleanup. We would go back and
12 retest that periodically. That would be part of the program.
13 Because with respect to the air in the ground water, even though
14 nothing directly is going to be done, you can say covering it
15 will help the air, but nothing is directing being done.

16 Those will be checked periodically, both the air monitoring
17 stations and all of those wells. There may even be some new
18 ones drilled to help check some deeper ones, and those will be
19 checked periodically through the remedial action, and even after
20 all of the construction is done. Because if a situation
21 develops in the future, we will have that taken care of.

22 SPECTATOR: I was wondering if the EPA's decision
23 to Alternative H, where the pile is not removed, G where it is
24 removed is primarily based on cost, or if there is some health
25 related reason why you choose not to remove the pile?

1 MR. BRADLEY: I actually have an overhead that
2 will help with that. I didn't put it up during my speech, but
3 I will put it up now.

4 What we use to evaluate the effectiveness of different
5 recommendations are what we call nine criteria. And this is
6 sort of a similar indication of those nine criteria. The
7 cleanup alternative reduces the possible health threat from the
8 site. That is called a long term effectiveness. The long term
9 complies with all of the requirements. That is all local state
10 requirements.

11 How long will the cleanup requirement protect the
12 community? And again that is sort of long term overall effect
13 of this concept.

14 Does the cleanup alternative solve the contamination
15 problems? And that is the question that was put forth earlier.
16 In other words, does it raise it forever? That's one of them.

17 How quickly will the contamination be solved? That's the
18 time period we gave for each of them.

19 How easily can the cleanup alternative be implemented? In
20 other words, is it something you can do, something with
21 equipment that exists, can it be done?

22 How much will the cleanup cost? How much does it cost the
23 state, depending on the state, state agencies, what is there
24 point and what does the community think?

25 We reviewed these nine criteria for each of these eight

1 alternatives that we looked at. And just to put it simply, the
2 alternative that takes everything out, it's not just that it
3 costs more. That's one thing. Obviously, it is higher. But
4 there are several problems associated with digging all of that
5 material up and taking it out.

6 You'll notice that the alternative we select does not
7 involve actually touching or doing anything with Taracorp pile.
8 It stays there. Things are brought in. And with the mixture
9 of waste that's in the Taracorp pile, it is not just a soil.
10 It is all kinds of things which will soak up, some will not.

11 The mixture, it is also three and a half acres. The mere
12 fact of digging that up, would and could expose the community
13 to a lot of dust during the process of digging that up. That
14 is definitely a negative aspect of it.

15 Another thing is, I'm not sure where the closest hazardous
16 waste landfill is to Granite City. But the closest one I know
17 is in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

18 SPECTATOR: Times Beach?

19 MR. BRADLEY: That's EPA compliant. That's a
20 distinction you have to make. There would be significant
21 hauling involved, which would increase a real risk from having
22 a lot of trucks going through the neighborhood, traveling long
23 distances, spilling materials off on the way, dust could be
24 generated while they are transporting the material. And what's
25 the final result, it's not here but it is where it is somewhere

1 else. It is sort of the same results. It is transplanted.
2 So those are some of the negative impacts of that last
3 alternative.

4 SPECTATOR: Our water comes from American Water
5 Works. It's about a half mile from here. And it's an open pit.
6 You know, it's an open concrete bunker. If you get a southeast
7 wind, it blows there to it. Would that lead be getting in there
8 or not?

9 MR. BRADLEY: Where exactly is that location?

10 SPECTATOR: About six or eight blocks from here.

11 MR. BRADLEY: Six or seven or eight blocks?

12 SPECTATOR: We get our drinking water from there.

13 MR. BRADLEY: Are you saying it's a pit?

14 What is it?

15 SPECTATOR: It's a concrete bunker.

16 SPECTATOR: It's a water treatment center.

17 MR. BRADLEY: Drinking water? I can't really
18 answer for what happened in the past. But since 1983, the
19 levels in the air have been well below the standards. And I
20 don't see that that would have much of any impact on that.

21 SPECTATOR: You said something about effect a
22 while ago.

23 MR. BRADLEY: That is tied in with what the
24 smelter stack did, which is '83 and back in time. I can't
25 answer to what happened before '83. But I know right now I

1 wouldn't consider that a real concern.

2 SPECTATOR: You don't remove this? If you stock
3 pile it, what would guarantee us that you didn't stock pile
4 other contaminated piles there?

5 MR. BRADLEY: You mean basically make it a
6 landfill?

7 SPECTATOR: Landfill.

8 MR. BRADLEY: That requirement would prohibit
9 that.

10 SPECTATOR: Like what?

11 MR. BRADLEY: It comes from the resource
12 conservation and preferable effect. Although I'm not an expert
13 on that law, there are requirements as far as bringing - - first
14 of all, Taracorp would have to allow it. That's the first
15 thing, and that's probably a significant hurdle right there.
16 They would be buying into more liability, which they wouldn't
17 like.

18 Second of all, the research recovery accident requires that
19 the material is taken to a landfill. This is not one. It won't
20 be one. That would not happen.

21 SPECTATOR: If they take all this material that
22 they dig up these yards - - this is directly across the street
23 from my house. How big of a pile am I going to be looking at?
24 Who is going to buy my house?

25 MS. LAFAIRE: The question is who will buy the

1 house.

2 MR. BRADLEY: First she asked how big would the
3 pile be. It would be a lot bigger than it is right now. It
4 would be twice the area.

5 And it's hard to answer that second question. Who would
6 buy your house? I mean your yard would be cleaned up to what
7 is considered to be a safe level, so that would a positive
8 benefit. You might consider that mound to be an eyesore, but
9 it would have a cap over it which would protect against the
10 direct contact and air emissions. It is really hard to answer
11 that question though.

12 Maryann, let me make one general comment. Any type of
13 question that we don't have an answer for, please submit those.
14 In fact, any question you ask, please submit them as comments.
15 We can then do some research on those and get a much better
16 answer. Just being here right now, and having the knowledge I
17 have at the moment, I can't answer that. But we will look into
18 that much further and answer that as a response to the part of
19 the comments.

20 SPECTATOR: I want to make a point. About three
21 years on Old 40, Collinsville Road, there's an old recycling
22 battery place, fifty foot wide, maybe a hundred foot long. They
23 removed all that dirt down to twenty-five feet, but they ain't
24 going to remove one whatever three acres of stock pile over
25 here? What's the difference?

1 MR. BRADLEY: I'm not familiar with that site.
2 I can't tell you. Maybe someone with Illinois EPA might be
3 familiar with it, but I'm not.

4 If I were to answer that, I would just be guessing. I'm
5 not familiar with that site.

6 SPECTATOR: I've got three small children. What
7 am I to do with my children while this cleanup is going on? I
8 mean the dirt is going to be up. I already had them tested for
9 lead. Am I going to have to pay again to have them retested?

10 MR. BRADLEY: Part of doing this, the remedy, is
11 part of that is controlling dust. That's a big concern. One
12 of those criteria up there is what's the short term impact.
13 Anything, you do may kick up some dust. Some things can be
14 worse than others.

15 What we're going to be dealing with here in the residential
16 area is soil, and soil can be wet down with water. Unless, you
17 know, I mean it may be raining already in which case it would
18 be wet. But if it's dry, such as in the summer, it would be
19 wet down and they would prevent or minimize dust being kicked
20 up. And actual time period that this would take would be about
21 one to two weeks, from the time we would come in and actually
22 start to do it, until you have the sod and everything replaced.
23 And the actual details of the sequence would be hard to know
24 right now.

25 But that's the general picture. We can control the dust

1 with water, and it would be something that would impact as far
2 as having equipment around for a short period of time, and then
3 it would be over. What to do in the meantime, like I said,
4 really the only danger would be just running into equipment,
5 something where the children would just have to be kept away
6 from the machinery.

7 And also to describe the type of machinery that would be
8 used, some won't be a machine. It would be a shovel. We're
9 talking about going down six inches. This won't be a back hoe
10 job. It wouldn't be the kind of stuff shown on the video. It
11 would be shovels, regular old shovels, or it would be a small
12 piece of equipment called a Bobcat, which has a fairly thin
13 blade, and one man sits in it. And it is really the size of a
14 car. And it is better for maneuvering around foundations and
15 things like that, so it wouldn't be the kind of impact with
16 heavy equipment and it wouldn't last that long. It is actually
17 a more minor situation than what they showed in that video.

18 SPECTATOR: You said water. Are you going to use
19 my water that I have to pay for?

20 MR. BRADLEY: We use a source of water, but you
21 wouldn't have to pay for it.

22 SPECTATOR: Are you just going to be addressing
23 land when you're getting rid of the six inches you talked about?
24 You talked about cadmium and magnesium in the soil. Are we
25 going to be stuck with having another survey to see if we have

1 other heavy metals, and it be dug up again, or can you test
2 everything and get everything?

3 MR. BRADLEY: We did check for other metals.
4 What happened, we went through the first time and checked for
5 lead. Then when we were checking the health effects of the lead
6 there, someone brought up the point that hey, there is other
7 metals that a smelter uses. It may not be in the same
8 quantities as lead, but there is arsenic, cadmium and magnesium.

9 And we went back and re-analyzed the same samples for the
10 others. And twenty-six are definitely more toxic than lead, or
11 at least the present thing that would be cadmium and arsenic,
12 which are carcinogens. And with the levels that were there of
13 cadmium and arsenic, and other metals, and compared to the level
14 of lead there, it was apparently that lead would be the main
15 health concern.

16 Even those other metals were there, they were much lower
17 concentrations - - well, the size of which would not exceed the
18 health risk of the lead. So it has been checked, and the final
19 conclusion is taking out the lead will take care of the other
20 problems on the surface.

21 SPECTATOR: In your discussion of the feasibility
22 of the recycling aspect for the pile, you mentioned something
23 about a ten percent volume reduction. Could you clarify that
24 a little bit? If it's mainly battery casings and lead, if
25 you're recycling and pulling out the lead.

1 And you mentioned the recovering the battery casings, how
2 can that act for a ten percent volume reduction? Aren't we
3 going to bring the recycled materials back?

4 MR. BRADLEY: What I mean by that is the physical
5 nature of the materials, the large chunks of slag, the actual
6 plastic pieces, rubber pieces. The only reduction that would
7 be effected by recycling is ten percent because of the nature
8 of those substances, and the lead content would lend itself to
9 where you could not recycle most of that. This is the trash
10 that they threw out. It is not what was put into the smelter.

11 Relative to the stuff that they melt down for sale, this
12 is, it's kind of like pile from a mine. It's a material that
13 has a much lower lead concentration, and can't really be
14 effectively recycled overall. A ten percent reduction was
15 something that was put into the graphs studied by NL
16 consultants. And U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA reviewed that and
17 basically agreed that that sounds about right.

18 SPECTATOR: I've got something I'd like to
19 address. It's been addressed by several folks around here. We
20 talked about the drinking water, as you mentioned, by this
21 gentleman over here. If you go ahead and remove whatever amount
22 you're going to shovel off the ground, take it over to the dump
23 site, you're going to get it down to keep it dry. While in the
24 work process, you can accomplish that.

25 Once you leave, and it gets rather windy at a particular

1 time, and the dirt dries out, you're going to have a lot of dust
2 flying around, and you're going to re-contaminate those closest
3 just the way National Lead did years ago. And if it happens to
4 generate itself in a windy direction towards that water pile
5 we have got, and you mentioned before five parts per mil, it
6 doesn't take much to contaminate our drinking water, and I
7 really think it is something that shouldn't be looked over. It
8 ought to be looked over very carefully.

9 MR. BRADLEY: I agree with that matter of remedy.
10 The materials would be brought into the site and capped. The
11 critical point would be between the time they are put on site
12 and the time that the cap is placed over. It would be a period
13 there where you would have soil that could be exposed. And,
14 again, that is something that either water or a sure factor in
15 something that would bind those parts together and keep them
16 from wandering that would be applied, and it would be used until
17 the cap was placed. The worse thing that could happen is
18 kicking up a bunch of dust, and the technology's there to do
19 that.

20 SPECTATOR: Do you know where the water came in
21 relation to Taracorp, how high is it?

22 MR. BRADLEY: I think it is about fifteen feet.

23 SPECTATOR: That sounds about right, pretty high.

24 SPECTATOR: I have a comment. First of all, just
25 answering his, in all probability, the houses of this area,

1 because of their age, have lead pipes, not only draining lines,
2 but sewer lines. As you're probably picking up, some lead
3 contamination is from that which, in my opinion, is probably
4 what you're going to the second question. I get a mixed feeling
5 here from concerns of people about the pile that's out there,
6 but yet the numbers in here indicate that the water
7 contamination, the air contamination and so on around the spill
8 are not abnormal. The ground contamination is in an area
9 immediately around the pile. But most of the outlying areas are
10 really contaminated mostly by the output of the smelter and so
11 on. Am I wrong in that assumption?

12 MR. BRADLEY: Well, no. Basically, you're not.
13 There is an exception to that. That's where the waste material
14 is right in the fill. There's a clear exception to that, such
15 as Venice and Eagle Park Acres. But the primary source of
16 contamination was the lead smelter tank, the stack, the areas
17 around the site.

18 MS. LAFIRE: We only have time for a couple more
19 questions. We seem like we're getting into comments at this
20 point. Two more questions, and we'll take a break and go to the
21 other portion.

22 SPECTATOR: You have a court reporter here, and
23 all the comments and questions will be documented. Now the
24 responsibility to make the decision, of what program will be
25 adopted, does that rest with the people right here in this

1 room, or is there someone outside the room here on the staff of
2 the U.S. EPA or Illinois EPA that will make this decision for
3 the people here in Venice and Madison and Granite City?

4 MR. BRADLEY: That's a good question. Actually,
5 U.S. EPA and Illinois EPA are both involved. So there will be
6 people from both agencies that will be involved in making the
7 decision.

8 SPECTATOR: None of the people here?

9 MR. BRADLEY: Actually, I'm the remedial project
10 manager. We also have my counterpart for Illinois EPA here,
11 but there's also management involved. In other words, I would
12 make a recommendation to my supervisor, and I would assume
13 Illinois EPA project manager would do the same. And it really
14 would come from our recommendation and their input on it.

15 And part of my recommendation is going to be based on
16 public comment, too. They will be aware of the answers that
17 we've given. When I say they, I mean the supervisors. They
18 will be aware of the answers given and the comments put forth.
19 So they will know that too. It is not just my responsibility.
20 It is not just Illinois EPA and project manager's
21 responsibility. It is also people above us.

22 MS. LAFIRE: We respond in writing to the
23 comments that are given tonight in that you can write in to us.
24 And the reason that we respond in writing is to make sure that
25 you're comments are answered and are part of the formal

1 decision.

2 I'm going to take another question over here.

3 I also want to say a few people have been leaving. If you
4 don't want to give an oral comment, write the comments in.

5 SPECTATOR: Am I correct in assuming that between
6 Alternative G and Alternative H is the cost of cleaning up the
7 pile, getting rid of it, out of here?

8 MR. BRADLEY: Could you repeat that?

9 SPECTATOR: Am I correct in assuming that
10 Alternative G and Alternative H is the cost of taking the pile
11 out of here?

12 MR. BRADLEY: It's more than that. It is part
13 of it, but also as posed to difficulties digging up materials
14 and bringing in a relatively short distance to be placed in the
15 pile. Those materials would have to be hauled a much greater
16 distance. The same materials would go into a pile under H, but
17 taken off under G, a high transportation cost plus the landfill
18 that receives those wastes will charge to take those.

19 SPECTATOR: I mean you spent money dealing with
20 the feasibility on those costs. Is there some way those costs
21 could be released to us? I mean you got a railroad right there,
22 and rail transportation is the cheapest. And I'm sure you got
23 the cost for how many dollars per ton it is to dump it at a
24 specific site. It just seem like, you know, not knowing the
25 cost of dumping it, pay to dump it on a particular site, it

1 seems like forty million dollars would be a lot of contractors,
2 that would welcome that kind of business.

3 MR. BRADLEY: The cost is real high. It is very
4 high to have it taken and dumped at a hazardous waste land fill.
5 They are basically accepting something that could give them a
6 problem in the future, and make them something that would have
7 to be involved in any cleanup on the landfill in that future.
8 There is a lot of liability that would make the cost very high.

9 SPECTATOR: Do you have those costs detailed out
10 where they would be released to the public?

11 MR. BRADLEY: That is something we don't have
12 right now. They do exist. Okay? But we don't have them with
13 us. That is something you can ask for. I would have to run
14 that by some people to see whether we can release those, but
15 please request those.

16 MS. LAFIRE: One more question.

17 SPECTATOR: I was just going to say, concerning
18 the fact that Taracorp and National Lead filed for bankruptcy,
19 is there any expectation that they will really pay?

20 MS. LAFIRE: The question is considering the
21 fact that National Lead and Taracorp has filed for bankruptcy,
22 is there any expectation that they will pay for this?

23 MR. SIEGEL: I think we can make a distinction
24 between National Lead, which is now NL Industries, have changed
25 their names and Taracorp. They are two separate corporations.

1 Taracorp filed BRANSI in December '82 and their involvement from
2 here forward will probably be minimal as part of their BRANSI.
3 They signed settlement which helped pay for the remedial
4 investigation, feasibility study that's already been conducted,
5 and also unless their ground water problems, which is not
6 anticipated here, they're probably out of the picture.

7 National Lead Industries is a separate company. They were
8 not part of any proceeding. So they are not.

9 MS. LAFAIRE: At this point, I'm going to call
10 a fifteen minute break. There are sheets of paper up here that
11 you can list. If you would like to give an oral comment, please
12 come over and sign up. If not, you have until the 24th. Thank
13 you all very much.

14 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

15 MS. LAFAIRE: We are in the portion of the
16 meeting where we are now accepting public comments, oral public
17 comments. There is a microphone on a stand in the middle of the
18 room. I'm going to ask that when I call your name, please come
19 up to the microphone and state your name and address very
20 clearly so we can have it for the record. And also please come
21 up to the microphone and speak into the microphone for your
22 comments so we can hear the comment and record it very clearly.

23 One more thing. We have about twenty people or so who have
24 signed on for comments. And it's getting pretty late. So I'm
25 going to ask, for the courtesy to everyone else, please try to

1 restrict your comments to ten minutes or less so we can get
2 through the list of comments so everybody will have a chance to
3 comment tonight.

4 I'll start with John Noderer.

5 MR. NODERER: My name is John Noderer. I live
6 right down the street, 2118 A, Delmar here in Granite City. And
7 I'll try and set an example for everyone else and be very short.

8 I would just like to ask that when this work gets to the
9 active stage and this work will be done, that specific dates
10 that work will be done in an area, not just one house in the
11 area, but that if they are going to be working in a
12 neighborhood, that the specific dates when the work will start
13 and when it will be finished be supplied to everyone in that
14 area; whether they are an owner or a tenant, be supplied so that
15 we, ourselves, can decide to voluntarily relocate during that
16 period so we won't have to be there.

17 So if it going to start on a Monday, we can decide to leave
18 on Saturday afternoon and stay out of town, or just visit
19 friends for two weeks. And I would like to emphasize that this
20 information should be supplied to all individuals residing
21 there. Because you can't depend on a landlord telling all of
22 his tenants that the work is going to be done. So do remember
23 to let us all know so we can plan ahead and leave if we want to.
24 Thank you.

25 MS. LAFIRE: Thank you, John.

1 Milton Morris, I think is the name. If I'm mispronouncing
2 names, please excuse me.

3 MR. MORRIS: I'm Milton Morris. I own the Milmor
4 Manufacturing Company in Venice, the steel fabricator. I've
5 been in Venice all my life. And John Irwin was saying that the
6 alleys in Venice need help. He was right. I would recommend
7 that instead of you going into the alleys, just go down and put
8 a strip of concrete on it. Not only to protect the people from
9 what's underneath the concrete, but you would be doing Venice
10 a big favor and spend some money so that we would have paved
11 alleys.

12 In fact, all the alleys are in that shape. Down in the old
13 rail yard, I didn't hear anybody say anything about that that
14 will be probably have to be dug up.

15 We're living here in this American place. It is the
16 American bottoms that is part of the Mississippi River. Many
17 many years ago and through vegetation of the ground is drawn up
18 where you got different levels of thickness.

19 Somebody mentioned the well went down and the water table
20 was fifteen feet. All this crust down to the bedrock, which is
21 sixty to ninety feet, is nothing about water and sand.

22 Now we are very fortunate that we have a tremendous supply
23 of water for industry. Now when we do something to that land
24 site or that pile of trash down there, and keep it there, we are
25 convicting that neighborhood never to develop the industry.

1 Even houses will not be built there just because it is there.

2 I recommend that you study the bluffs around the American
3 bottoms, and start at Dupo and go clean up through Alton. These
4 are clay bluffs. A septic tank system in that clay dirt will
5 not absorb water.

6 Now if you take some place in the bluffs, maybe a mile back
7 from the bluff itself and prepare a site, move this pile and
8 cover it over with four or five feet of that clay, then you're
9 protected forever.

10 Now the runoff of water on the bluffs is tremendous. The
11 Metro East Sewer System has a terrible problem containing the
12 water on a heavy rain because it runs off those bluffs. It will
13 not sink into that clay. You are lucky you have some clay that
14 close.

15 Instead of you moving that clay to Taracorp Corporation
16 site, move that pile of stuff out there and cap it over with
17 four or five feet of clay, and you're protected forever. That
18 would be my recommendation, instead of doing something that
19 would retard the industrial development of this American bottom.

20 We are very fortunate that it looks like in the future that
21 we're going to develop this area. And many years ago when Mill
22 Creek was owning the business, Mill Creek went to St. Louis.
23 They went to St. Louis County. Not one came across the river.
24 There was four hundred businesses.

25 Now we're in a position with some of the new highways that

1 we can develop this American Bottom with industry, and industry
2 is what we need. We'll get the people if we get the industry.

3 We got some smoke stack industry that nobody in EPA likes.
4 But believe it or not, we need the smoke stack industry in this
5 area if we're going to be hiring people, to live here. But we
6 have a wonderful opportunity to develop.

7 Now 203 site for the landfill, I don't understand how it
8 ever became possible for the City of St. Louis to use Madison
9 County for a dump. Now from when Butch Lamire started the first
10 site there on 203, which is now a tremendous thing, fifty years
11 from now, the State of Illinois will spend millions of dollars
12 there.

13 One of the United Disposal employees have came into my shop
14 and told me about the hundreds and hundreds of barrels that were
15 put into that pile that Butch Lamire started. Some day we're
16 going to pay for that. And he was concerned about it because
17 them barrels now are about twenty, thirty years old and will
18 start to leak. And when it does, all of this water table that
19 we got underneath all of this will. Collinsville gets their
20 water from the American bottoms, and we are going to have a
21 tremendous problem with the landfill on 203. The landfill at
22 Chain of Rocks should have never been started. Why we let
23 Missouri bring the trash over here, I don't understand.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MS. LAFAIRE: Thank you, Mr. Morris.

1 Casmir Skubish?

2 Walter Perior?

3 MR. PERIOR: My name is Walter Perior. I live
4 at 2416 State Street, which is as I understand just across the
5 great line of demarcation. I'm also an environmental
6 consultant.

7 I have a couple perspectives to this problem. I also have
8 a number of questions that I didn't get a chance to ask because
9 of the time constraints, and I apologize for not having more
10 information because it is available. The library does have a
11 copy of the study that is done on the site.

12 And if you could perhaps just give me some quick responses
13 to questions like the lines that distinguish the contaminated
14 areas from non-contaminated are very clearly for the street
15 lines, and that doesn't seem realistic. That doesn't sound like
16 five hundred park contour map.

17 How secure or certain are you that you have confined a five
18 hundred park area? Is there a possibility that other areas
19 could be tested, that we could look for if it has already been
20 determined, that we will not pursue that course? I would urge
21 you to reconsider that, consider that so that the people that
22 may still have contamination problems can have that
23 investigated. With respect to the various options that you
24 proposed for the closure of the site itself, I don't have any
25 problems with the technical approaches that you've taken.

1 My main concern is with the health issues that arise from
2 the cleanup of the neighborhoods. And I was a little bit upset
3 to see that the Department of Health was not more formally
4 involved in this public hearing tonight.

5 I would urge that they take a higher profile position in
6 upcoming events, and that perhaps a more regular meeting
7 schedule could be established, so that more local governmental
8 agencies can be represented more often, so that we can voice
9 these kinds of concerns and continue some kind of dialogue to
10 address problems that may come up. Because we know that even
11 after you draft your remedial action plans, that changes have
12 to be made and consequences to reality have to be made on a day
13 to day basis.

14 One of the comments made tonight was we don't have
15 established cleanup standard for lead. We do have a regulatory
16 cleanup standard for lead, if we look at the toxic traction
17 procedure.

18 I would like to know if the EPA tests were run on any areas
19 outside of the site, the narrowly defined site, if any of the
20 soil samples that were taken from residences or other areas
21 around the plant were justified as toxic traction procedure that
22 would indicate whether or not people actually have a hazardous
23 waste characteristic, have hazardous waste in their yards. Do
24 you happen to know the answer to that question, or you're not
25 answering questions right now?

1 MS. LAFaire: We'll be answering questions after
2 we conclude the formal part. We will answer it formally. If
3 you want to close it as a question, as part of the comment.

4 MR. PERIOR: I'd like to just conclude by saying
5 that we can continue to have a dialogue, and some kind of input
6 in this process throughout the entire mediation of steps.
7 Thank you.

8 MS. LAFaire: Thank you, Mr. Perior.

9 John Belcoff?

10 R. Kerstod?

11 W. Lamere?

12 How about Patrick Foley?

13 John Irwin?

14 Kathy Andrea?

15 MS. ANDREA: I also am concerned about the health
16 department and people being involved in this. I think some sort
17 of procedure should be established now for testing, especially
18 young children. There's a number of children in that area that
19 are from families who can't afford to go and spend twenty-five
20 dollars to have each child tested. There should be some way of
21 testing.

22 And the older people who have been tested, they have been
23 eating out of these gardens for years. Some of them have lived
24 to ninety-four. I'd like to know what their level of lead is.
25 I'm curious. You can test that. You can test children.

1 Do we have any levels that we know of, blood levels that
2 you've tested of the people in the area? If you're going ahead
3 and digging up and everything and stirring up all this so
4 everybody who is living there now is going to have all this dust
5 they're breathing, tracking it into the house - - I have this
6 vision of someone standing with a watering hose.

7 I mean you're digging with a shovel and watering with the
8 watering hose, with this level of lead, and it is not an
9 appropriate way to go about and to really clean up something
10 that sounds as scary as hell.

11 MS. LAFAIRE: Thank you.

12 Janet Smith?

13 MS. SMITH: I think I'm going to turn the
14 microphone around because my remarks really are addressed here
15 to the public. And before I start to speak, I have some
16 handouts that we put together and prepared to distribute to the
17 people who are interested in taking with them a copy of our
18 remarks. And I'll leave them right up here.

19 My name is Janet Smith. I'm with NL Industries. You've
20 heard a lot this evening about the remedial investigation study
21 that NL conducted. We stepped forward and voluntarily entered
22 an agreement with EPA and Illinois EPA to conduct what's called
23 a Remedial Investigation of Feasibility Study at the Taracorp
24 site.

25 This is a process that began in 1985 and took five years,

1 and cost a million and a half dollars to complete. At the
2 conclusion of the study, we concluded that the best alternative
3 for cleaning up the Taracorp site, and the surrounding areas,
4 was the alternative that you've heard EPA describe here tonight
5 as Alternative D. EPA did not agree with Alternative D, and
6 they presented to you tonight their preferred alternative, which
7 they call Alternative H.

8 I'd like to speak a little bit about the difference between
9 Alternative D and Alternative H, because we have heard some of
10 them tonight. I think I can put them in a slightly different
11 perspective for you.

12 Now in many ways, Alternative D and Alternative H are the
13 same. They are the same in that they all start with moving the
14 pile from St. Louis Recyclers to the Taracorp pile. They all
15 include recycling from the Taracorp pile, and they conclude with
16 leaving the pile in place, covering it with a thick cap and
17 membrane and covering it over with grass, and in the future
18 maintaining fence around the site and install wells to test the
19 grounds. And I think it is a long term program of ground well
20 monitoring as well as air monitoring, so in those ways the two
21 alternatives are the same. The primary difference has to do
22 with the level of lead and soil that clean up the surrounding
23 residential areas, too.

24 Now before I talk about that difference, I'd like to just
25 present some, I think, positive information about the results

1 of the remedial investigation study, because we've all heard
2 tonight a lot of concerns that are expressed by the community.

3 Is my health endangered? Is my health at risk? Am I being
4 exposed to harmful contaminants?

5 Well, you can all inspect the study that is on file at
6 Granite City library. I think the results would be of most
7 interest to you. In that study, found in public drinking water,
8 was to the detection that means that the lead was so low that
9 the measuring instrument could not pick it up.

10 In addition to the study, found that level of air that we
11 breathe was 0.2 micrograms and EPA said this is below the
12 federal standard. Federal standard is 1.5. Federal standard
13 for lead in air is designed to protect the public health. So
14 this is telling you that the level of lead that was detected in
15 the remedial investigation study was 0.2, while the standard
16 said that protected public health was 1.5.

17 In addition you heard - - I think you heard something
18 confusing was about blood tests, and you heard reference earlier
19 to an Illinois Department Health Study.

20 Illinois Department of Health did do a study in 1983. It
21 was based on blood sampling in 1972, 1988 and 1976. That showed
22 that, based on nineteen of ninety-seven people sampled, there
23 was no elevated blood levels in the community, no adverse
24 effects detected in the individuals that were tested.

25 Now EPA doesn't like the study because they feel that that

1 is not the adequate predicament of the community. They feel it
2 is not protective to sustain from a study to the level of lead
3 in the entire community. They may be right. But I think if I
4 were in a community, I would want to know what extent that any
5 one was studied that no adverse health effects were found.

6 Let me just get back to the differences between five
7 hundred and a thousand points per mil. The starting point for
8 determining level of the soil for clean up is EPA's guidance
9 that you should conduct a risk assessment. And once you
10 conducted this assessment, you should apply the results to your
11 community and select a level that may range from five hundred
12 to a thousand parts per mil. Although it may range up and down
13 depending on sets of circumstances, this is what N L did.

14 We conducted a risk assessment. We calculated exposure of
15 residence of lead in the surrounding environment in two
16 different ways. We had expert independent toxicologists do
17 this. Those persons, toxicologists, recommended a cleanup level
18 for residential averaging one thousand three hundred eighty
19 parts per mil, because we felt that it would be good to give the
20 community of Granite City safety.

21 We proposed an alternative deed, a cleanup to a thousand
22 parts per mil. Now we have asked EPA why, despite the risk
23 assessment, they have chosen a level of five hundred parts per
24 mil. What they say in response to that is one, they don't
25 believe the risk assessment. They don't like it. They're not

1 comfortable with this.

2 When we ask how do you pick five hundred parts per mil,
3 they have not performed their own risk assessment. What they
4 do is they refer to other sites that have absolutely nothing in
5 common with Granite City. I think you heard EPA say something
6 different. Five hundred parts per mil is that there might be
7 other contaminants in the soil that would drive a cleanup level
8 down, but then that the soil was tested. There were no other
9 contaminants in the soil. It was absolutely nothing there.
10 That was looked at in remedial investigation.

11 So there is no reason to clean up the five hundred parts
12 per mil, that they have been able to articulate to us. And
13 further their own national guidance requires them to conduct a
14 site specific risk to take into act what would be a risk for
15 the community. You haven't learned of an individual study, and
16 as I haven't heard what the toxicity of lead is.

17 This is a highly technical term used by environmentalists
18 to define hazardous waste, EPA toxicity. It was not detectable.
19 It means there was no hazardous waste. I don't want to take up
20 much more time. I know it is getting very late and other people
21 want to speak.

22 I would like to address what we see as some of the negative
23 sides of EPA's, which is Alternative H. Most of you have heard,
24 I've heard tonight many of the criticisms that have been made,
25 traffic, noise. You'll have traffic. You've have noise,

1 exhaust and you will have parking problems. You will have
2 pressure on the roads.

3 But I think if I were living in Granite City, I would be
4 most concerned about what EPA has written in their fact sheet.
5 All of it exposed the community to certain measurements of
6 contaminated results to digging. This to us is the problem and
7 it seems foolish to inflict when the studies have been done to
8 show there is no existing problem.

9 I would like to end by making a few comments on some of
10 EPA on Alternative H. Two weeks ago they issued a public
11 information sheet that says Alternative H, their alternative,
12 costs thirty million. Tonight you see they changed the number
13 to twenty-five million dollars. They changed the number because
14 they made an arithmetic mistake. I'm sorry. It should be
15 twenty-five. We checked the number. We checked. In truth it
16 should be like thirty million. That means the difference of
17 residential soil clean up cost between Alternative H and
18 Alternative D is roughly ten to one.

19 The other area where they're wrong when they say one and
20 a half to two and a half years. It is completely off base. It
21 is seven years. You can't accelerate the base by clean up by
22 bringing in more crews because Granite City is small. Granite
23 City can't overload the roads.

24 Then they were riding by bringing more people and more
25 trucks, and doing it faster. We've calculated that it would

1 take seven years, and I think we would be prepared to share our
2 calculations with you.

3 I thank you all very much for your attention. And I and
4 the other people who are here from NL this evening would be
5 happy to answer any questions you have. We have left handouts.

6 I would like to reiterate when they say we like to submit
7 your comments for the record, if you're really interested, it
8 is not enough to come to a public hearing. You have to write
9 comments and send them to EPA and come and send them in for
10 public comment.

11 MS. LAFAIRE: Thank you.

12 Terry Long?

13 MR. LONG: I've got a small problem. I got a
14 house at 1704 State Street that in November caught on fire and
15 burnt down. I was in the process of having it torn down and
16 cleaned out until all this come out. Now I'm stuck with a house
17 that I can't tear down. I can't touch the dirt. I can't get
18 a contractor in there to do anything with it until you people
19 decide which in the city.

20 I probably don't have another thirty days, before I have
21 to tear the house down. So now I'm stuck here with all these
22 people wanting to know about landfills. I got a problem now and
23 I have to take care of, not a year from now or two years from
24 now. I have to do something with this now and not later.

25 And as far as the site, the time and all that, they just

1 keep talking about they are going to bring their stuff over
2 there to St. Louis over here. We got enough here. We don't
3 need anymore.

4 That's all I got to say.

5 MS. LAFAIRE: Brett Hanke?

6 MR. HANKE: My comments are directed to EPA, but
7 also to the people who are here. My name is Brett Hanke, two
8 T's and an E, no Y. I live at 2145 Cleveland. I'm an engineer.
9 I've lived in Granite City for about ten years with my family,
10 four kids.

11 I have a four year old and a ten year old. We officially
12 refer to the four year old as the filth monster. He is very
13 intimately involved in the dirt in this city, very active child.

14 But before I go any further, I would like to preference
15 this whole presentation by saying that I am somewhat insensed
16 by what the EPA's approach to this meeting is tonight.

17 The purpose of this meeting was to solicit comments from
18 the public. Yet the EPA spoke to us, selling their position,
19 for two and one half hours before they solicited the first
20 comment. And, as you have heard, two thirds of the people
21 making comments have left.

22 Now what was the purpose of this meeting? The purpose of
23 this meeting was so the EPA could sell Alternative H. Well, I
24 came here in a relatively subdued manner, relatively unbiased.
25 I'm not quite so unbiased at this point. I'm a little bit

1 upset.

2 First of all, EPA and the industries have met and they
3 agreed essentially on what they want to do. The industries
4 being, essentially headed by NL, National Lead. And they have
5 agreed to do everything on their little lists. The only thing
6 they disagree on is how much of our yards they are going to dig
7 up.

8 The City is trying to re-develop our downtown area. We're
9 not going to be able to get a developer to even look at this
10 town, as long as this thing is hanging over our head. And
11 whoever knows what the conventional cost will be to the City.

12 Now we got the two proposals, that National Lead indicates
13 probably seven million dollars, consolidates all the piles, puts
14 with the Taracorp pile, digs up the alleys, puts it on the
15 Taracorp pile, maybe pave some of the alleys, digs up all the
16 soils with contamination with thousand parts per mil, puts that
17 on the pile, back up the areas they dug up, caps the pile,
18 isolates the pile with the fences, and other barriers and
19 conducts air and water monitoring by the pile.

20 Now the EPA alternative, for an additional eighteen million
21 dollars, that's their estimate. It would be twenty-eight, in
22 what Taracorp says. I'll get to that. National Lead says - -
23 I'll get that a little later. And all that does is that adds
24 the area that is in the range of the five hundred to one
25 thousand parts per mil.

1 If you'll look at your little handout here, the handout
2 says and I quote, a federal health agency recommends that quote
3 in general, land, soil and dust appears to be, appears to be
4 responsible for higher blood levels in children. When the
5 concentration in the soil or dust is at levels higher than five
6 hundred to one thousand parts per mil, EPA uses this to evaluate
7 the health risks from lead.

8 So it appears that you can get a change in the blood level
9 of a child if it's above five hundred and one thousand. Is that
10 above five hundred? Is that above a thousand? Is it proof
11 positive? No. It appears. It appears. So there is not a
12 whole lot of credibility in that criteria. Is there?

13 I have an idea, and I proposed this to EPA at the meeting
14 Wednesday, a little meeting over at KC. Why don't we do what
15 you agree to do? Let's get started. Let's get the monkey off
16 our backs. I mean you agree that you want to consolidate the
17 piles. You want to dig up the alleys. You want to cap the
18 ground, dig in put in additional caps per pile. Let's start.
19 Agree to get started.

20 What's that going to do for you? It removes the major
21 health hazard in the area right now, and it provides you some
22 time to do a little research and determine what it is exactly
23 you want to do after that. And, hopefully, it gets the problem
24 off the City back so we can get on with things, our lives,
25 tearing down our buildings, and hopefully redeveloping the

1 downtown area.

2 Now there's some thoughts I had on the differences in the
3 risk assessment, as was mentioned. There was a decent decree.
4 EPA agreed with the industries to conduct a risk assessment.
5 This was all monitored by the Court, They agreed that any
6 decision was going to be based on this site, specifically
7 Granite City oriented risk assessment, and they agreed that
8 National Lead would conduct it.

9 And during the course of this, they agreed on several
10 different criteria. And as the criteria in the water for lead
11 changes, and they thought about changing criteria for the lead
12 and soil, and some other things changed, like they threw out
13 what they thought was the official acceptable level of lead in
14 soil, or whatever. They all agreed on what would then be used
15 and would be acceptable.

16 So they agreed to everything, but now EPA doesn't agree
17 that their study was represented. They had decided arbitrarily,
18 which I have seen no justification, and so far they have been
19 unable to offer to me any justification, scientifically, for
20 five hundred parts per mil, certainly nothing that is Granite
21 City site specific.

22 So they said no health risk is what they are trying to
23 achieve. No measurable change is what they decide to do just
24 for criteria. They are not related. No measurable change in
25 blood level does not necessarily mean there is not health risk,

1 probably way too conservative.

2 And we're all going to pay. We're going to pay by higher
3 prices for what we got to pay for that National Lead and these
4 other industries. And we're going to pay because our property
5 levels are going to go down. And there is a whole bunch of ways
6 we're going to pay. I'll get to that again, too.

7 The normal blood level for lead is between twelve and five
8 parts for mil. And above twenty-five parts per mil, you're
9 considered sick, if I'm not mistaken. I get a waive there from
10 the health care guy. I'm close anyway. Thank you.

11 There is no way you can equate soil directly to blood
12 levels because there are too many other factors. What's the
13 exposure? How much dirt did the kid eat? What was the
14 concentration in the dirt? How long has he lived in that area
15 eating that? How much flushed out of his system? The whole
16 thing is based on no scientific basis. I have to say National
17 Lead really - - it is based on science, but it is not valid
18 perhaps than even that.

19 Now apparently there was the risk assessments, and the kid
20 who ate a lot of dirt and lived in the dirt, like my kids do,
21 if the dirt at fifteen hundred parts per mil he might show a
22 change in his blood level. National Lead apparently accepted
23 a thousand as being a conservative criteria, and agreed to
24 accept that and dig up all the areas where they had soils above
25 a thousand. So there is no standard.

1 So what I'm going to propose is lets use the standard.
2 First, let's get together. But, second, let's use the standard
3 we can hang our hat, that is blood lead level, and let's get
4 them together and let's talk about twenty-five parts per mil.
5 Be conservative. Go down to twenty or fifteen, but establish
6 criteria.

7 First of all, let's do now what we agreed to do. Let's
8 start getting things going, test the blood levels, blood levels
9 of people in the area. Develop a real correlation specific to
10 this Granite City area that is actually Granite City data.
11 Then perhaps what you could do is take that information, the
12 location of where that person lives, and develop and justify
13 blood lead levels for that person, based upon their activity in
14 the soil, their time and exposure in the soil, or in the area,
15 and their actual tested blood level. But before you go to all
16 the trouble to add all that, manage and determine what you're
17 going to dig up.

18 Let's get together, industry and EPA, and determine what
19 the acceptable criteria is going to be. Is it going to be
20 fifteen parts per mil blood lead? But get together. Sort out
21 first, then do your survey, so that you don't have to adjust the
22 survey to match what you want to achieve.

23 So what's the demarcation for the proposal? Neither the
24 EPA nor the National Lead's position is really accurately,
25 vitally, scientifically based. Maybe too lenient, maybe it

1 endangers your health, my health, and our kids health. I'm not
2 for that.

3 As long as it's reasonable. So what's the problem with
4 digging up an additional square block area? What's the problem
5 with that? We got dust in the air and exposure.

6 You saw in the movie the guy standing there with the garden
7 hose misting while fifty caterpillar lifts go rowing by. I'm
8 sorry. In the summer, garden hose isn't going to keep the dust
9 down. You won't get the areas under the pavement. You're going
10 to ruin property values, if not through the long term, at least
11 during the clean up period. You're going to have an
12 astronomical cost, twenty-five, thirty million dollars. I mean
13 the lottery isn't even that high very often.

14 I have a construction management background. I'm a civil
15 engineer. I've been working construction for seven years, and
16 I seriously, very seriously, question two and a half years at
17 a price of twenty-five million dollars. I worked directly with
18 the earth moving. I was in charge of rebuilding the run bases
19 out at Lambert Airport. And I'm telling you, you're talking
20 more than twenty-five million dollars to dig up a hundred square
21 block area.

22 You're going to be working around earth moving, repairing
23 roads, sidewalks. How do you think the dumpster is going to
24 back over the sidewalks and curbs? Which they are going to be
25 damaged. I wonder if that is factored into the twenty-five

1 million dollar cost estimate, having to replace the curbs in
2 that area.

3 MS. LAFIRE: Excuse me. You're up to fifteen
4 minutes.

5 MR. HANKE: That is fine. You talked for two and
6 a half hours. Give me two minutes.

7 I'm irate. I'm the first one to sign up and the last one
8 to speak.

9 We don't need a pile being the landmark of Granite City for
10 being a tourist attraction. We need a small pile. I never
11 noticed the Taracorp. If it can be kept somewhere close to
12 that, I think it is reasonable. You got a tremendous
13 inconvenience. You're digging up the earth, you're moving
14 everything, moving fence, dust falling in and through and by
15 your house. You can't park in front of your house. You can't
16 hardly live in front of your house. You got all that water that
17 you're misting with running into curbs down the street, being
18 tracked all over town and getting into the sewer system.

19 I'm in charge. I happened to be the Director of Public
20 Works. I can tell you it is hard to get lead out of the water
21 going into the treatment, unless you have a process to do that
22 like we did in Sauget where I worked for a while. That's going
23 to be a problem, sewage treatment, the whole point is it is
24 probably not necessary.

25 So I'm going to skip my clashendo ending here and let's say

1 let's do something for once that makes some sense. Let's start
2 now. Let's do some research. Let's get the two parties
3 together, get them talking to each other, and let EPA share the
4 information.

5 You tap dance around. I know of that health study real
6 well. It is there. It exists. I know it does. You know,
7 don't hide it. Don't say hey, we can't give you our cost
8 estimates. We pay for those costs estimates. Our tax dollars
9 pay your salaries. That is a matter of record. Those are not
10 classified secret. I assure you. If they are issued, have
11 access to them. I have a need to know.

12 I am directly affected, and I have a security clearance
13 due to my national guard. Unless they're top secret, I probably
14 could see them. And if they are, I'll probably see them next
15 month. I have an action in to get to know the secret. More
16 importantly, let's justify for once what needs to be done.

17 MS. LAFAIRE: Thank you, Mr. Hanke.

18 Joe W. Robert?

19 There are no more names that I have listed in. If there
20 is anyone that I neglected to call, raise your hand.

21 With this, I'm going to conclude this public meeting. I
22 would like to encourage everyone to feel free to write your
23 comments to us, public comment does not end until the 24th.
24 Any comments that are postmarked up to that date will be
25 considered as part of this public record. Thank you all very

1 much for coming.

2 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded.)

3

4

1

2

I, Karon A. Voloski, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within the County of Madison, State of Illinois, do certify that there came before me the U. S. EPA Public Hearing, NL/Taracorp Superfund Site, conducted by MaryAnn Croce LaFaire on February 8, 1990, at Granite City Township Hall, 2060 Delmar Avenue, Granite City, Illinois, that thereafter, said hearing was reduced to shorthand by me on the day, between the hours, at the place and in that behalf first aforesaid, and later transcribed into typewriting, and said hearing is now herewith returned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and Seal this 2nd day of March, 1990.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES SEPTEMBER 1, 1991.

KARON A. VOLOSKI,

Shorthand Reporter & Notary Public